

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/664,781 | 09/16/2003 | Christophe Maleville | 4717-6100 | 4844 |
| 28765 7 | 590 05/04/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| WINSTON & STRAWN LLP | | CARRILLO, BIBI SHARIDAN | | |
| 1700 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1746 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| to | Im. |
|----|------|
| _ | 7. • |

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 10/664,781 | MALVILLE ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Sharidan Carrillo | 1746 | | |

| | Sharidan Carrillo | 1740 | |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 19 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | ALLOWANCE. | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notation (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in composition following time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep | affidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 C | ence, which CFR 41.31; or |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o | of the final rejection. | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened states above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the | The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) | n fee under 37 as set forth in (b) |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com | oliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be | e filed within two mon | the of the date |
| of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must b AMENDMENTS | xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e) |), to avoid dismissal of | of the appeal. |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a brie | f, will not be entered t | pecause |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co | nsideration and/or search (see NC | TE below); | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | | · | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | | | the issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a | | ejected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-C | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). | | | |
| 7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | ill be entered and an | explanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5 and 11-24</u> . | | · | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but | it before or on the date of filing a b | ulation of Appendix will m | at ha autanad |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | d sufficient reasons why the affida | vit or other evidence is | s necessary |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | vercome all rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fai | Is to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio | n of the status of the claims after a | entry is below or attac | 1). hed |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | · | ormy is below or attac | ied. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | t does NOT place the application i | n condition for allowa | nce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | No(s) | |
| 13. Other: | 70 0 n | _ | |
| | of allo | Sharidan Carrilla | |
| F | SHARIDAN CARRILLO PRIMARY EXAMINER | Sharidan Carrillo Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1746 | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive for the reasons set forth in the Final Office Action. In additon, applicant argues that Wu fails toteach directly exposing the etched hydrophophic surface to a gaseous ozone atmosphere. Applicant is directed to Fig. 5, which teaches a BOE etch followed by treatment with ozone. Additionally, applicant's claim language of comprising does not exclude intermediate treatment steps since comprising is open-ended. Applicant's claim language is not limited to the exclusion of intermediate steps. If this is applicant's intent, the examiner suggests amending the claims to recite "consisting of". Applicant further argues that Wu fails to teach an immersion step, the limitations of which are relied upon by Kenny. Additionally, as admitted by the prior art and by applicant, such steps are conventionally and notoriously used n the semiconductor art. Applicant further argues that Kenny fails to teach immersion, applicant is directed to paragraph 38 which teaches that the liquid may be applied in other ways such as immersion. Applicant argues that Geusic fails to teach a closed container. Geusic is relied upon to teach bonding and annealing. Applicant's arguments have been considered but not deemed persuasive for the reasons presented as well as the reasons set forth in the Final Office Action.